

apuntes

Reflexiones teológicas desde el contexto Hispano-Latino

**Los inicios de la Iglesia Episcopal en Puerto Rico:
el caso de Ponce y Vieques, 1874-1900**

Iván R. Buxeda Díaz, Ph. D.

**Theotokos of Byzantium & Guadalupe of Tepeyac:
Patristics, Typology, and the Incarnation**

Josefrayn Sánchez-Perry

PROCESSED

JUN 18 2013

GTU LIBRARY

Year 33, No 1

Spring 2013

Año 33, No 1

Primavera, 2013

Apuntes

Theological Reflections from a Hispanic-Latino Context

Publisher

Jeannie Treviño-Teddle
*Director, Mexican American
Program, Perkins School of
Theology*

Editor

Hugo Magallanes
*Associate Professor
Perkins School of Theology*

Book Review Editor

Edwin Aponte
*Research Professor
New York Theological
Seminary*

Editorial Board

Justo L. González
Editor Emeritus

Luis G. Pedraja
Editor Emeritus

Roberto L. Gómez
Editorial Board Chair

Minerva Carcaño
*Bishop
Desert Southwest Conference*

Mary Catherine Dean
*The United Methodist
Publishing House*

Nora Lozano Diaz
*Professor
Baptist University of the
Americas*

Saul Espino
*United Methodist Church
General Board of Higher
Education and Ministry*

Joaquin Garcia
*Director HispanicLatino
Academy, Tennessee
Conference*

Carmen Gaud
*International Editor
The Upper Room*

Rebeca Radillo
*Associate Professor
New York Theological
Seminary*

Saul Trinidad
*National Plan for Hispanic
Ministry of the United
Methodist Church*

Apuntes (ISSN # 0279-9790) is published quarterly by the Mexican American Program, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX 75275. Periodical postage paid at Dallas, TX 75260 and additional mailing offices. **Subscription** is \$15 per year and \$25 for two years.

Direct inquiries about subscriptions to the Mexican American Program, Perkins School of Theology, or call (214) 768-2265.

POSTMASTER, send address changes to: **Apuntes**, Mexican American Program, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX 75275.

Manuscripts are to be sent to the editor, Dr. Hugo Magallanes, as email attachments to hugo@smu.edu. **Materials sent in Microsoft Word Documents are appreciated.** E-mail editorial inquiries or comments to apuntes@smu.edu.

Mailing and printing of **Apuntes** are provided by the United Methodist Publishing House.

From the Editor

History is an important component in our identity, it is crucial to understand who we are today and the factors which, in a negative or positive way, were present in the developing of denominations, theological tendencies, and interpretations of historical events. In this issue of *Apuntes*, two historical recollections are featured. First, an article that traces the historical roots and origins of The Episcopal Church in Puerto Rico, written by Dr. Iván R. Buxeda Díaz, who obtained a doctoral degree in Latin American and Puerto Rican History from Universidad de Puerto Rico, Recinto de Río Piedras; and a M. Div. from Seminario Episcopal San Pedro y San Pablo y del Seminario Evangélico de Puerto Rico. In addition to these degrees, Dr. Buxeda Díaz holds a M. Education in History from Universidad de Puerto Rico. Dr. Buxeda Díaz has served as a Priest at Parroquia La Resurrección de Manatí and at Parroquia San Pedro y San Pablo de Bayamón. In addition to these ministerial positions; he also serves as a professor at Universidad de Puerto Rico, Recinto de Arecibo and at Universidad Interamericana, Recinto de Arecibo.

The author of the second article is Mr. Josefrayn Sánchez-Perry, who is a Master of Divinity candidate at Perkins School of Theology. He obtained a BA in Religion from Northwestern College; and in addition to his studies at Perkins, he also works for the Mexican American Program and the Center for the Study of Latino/a Christianity & Religions at Southern Methodist University. Upon graduation, Mr. Sánchez-Perry hopes to pursue a Ph.D. in the History of World Christianity. Mr. Sánchez-Perry's article presents an excellent historical and theological analysis of the origins and connections between, Mary, Guadalupe and Christ.

I am delighted to present these historical interpretations and I hope that their contributions and insights will help us to see the past in a new way, and then consider the opportunities and responsibilities we have as we face the present and the future in our ministries.

Los inicios de la Iglesia Episcopal en Puerto Rico: el caso de Ponce y Vieques, 1874-1900

Iván R. Buxeda Díaz, Ph. D.

“Hemos atravesado el mar océano para imponer la ley de Cristo y lo hemos logrado en las misas, en las procesiones, en las fiestas patronales, pero no en las almas”.¹

1. Trasfondo histórico: Puerto Rico durante los siglos XVI al XIX

Durante los primeros tres siglos de la historia colonial de Puerto Rico, Inglaterra mostró cierto interés tanto político como comercial por el archipiélago borincano. Puerto Rico tenía una buena localización estratégica en el centro de las Américas, es la puerta del Canal de Panamá y la posesión española más cercana a Europa.

La agresión inglesa contra Puerto Rico comenzó con el ataque de Sir Francis Drake a la bahía de San Juan en 1595 que fracasó al sucumbir ante la artillería española desplegada en el Castillo de San Felipe del Morro. En 1598, George Clifford el Conde de Cumberland logró capturar San Juan, pero no logró obtener el control de resto de la isla. Las fuerzas inglesas terminaron por abandonar San Juan dos meses después debido a una epidemia de disentería. El 5 de agosto, 1702 dos barcos ingleses atacaron Arecibo, el capitán Antonio de los Reyes Correa defendió con gallardía y repelió el ataque inglés. Los ingleses no intentaron arrebatarle la Isla a España hasta la Guerra de Sucesión Española (1701-1714) cuando fracasaron en sus proyectos de invasión por Arecibo y Loíza. El ataque inglés dirigido por Ralph Abercromby en 1797 fue rechazado efectivamente por las fuerzas españolas y por las milicias de criollos y morenos.² Otros ataques ingleses de menor importancia no tuvieron éxito, por ejemplo: Aguadilla (1787); Cabo Rojo (1799); Ponce (1800 y 1801) en 1801 volvieron atacando otra vez Aguadilla.³

¹ Gabriel García Márquez, *Del amor y otros demonios* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1994), p. 140.

² Arturo Morales Carrión, *Puerto Rico and the Non-Hispanic Caribbean: A Study in the Decline of Spanish Exclusivism* (San Juan: Editorial de la U.P.R., 1971); Juan M. Zapatero, *La guerra en el Caribe en el siglo XVIII* (San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 1964).

³ John H. Parry, *El imperio español de ultramar* (Madrid: Editorial Aguilar, 1970), p. 278; Enrique T. Blanco, *Los tres ataques británicos a San Juan Bautista de Puerto*

Inglaterra comenzó la colonización de St. Kitts en 1623, Barbados y Nevis en 1627, Antigua y Monserrate entre 1628 a 1632. Luego, ocuparon Jamaica en 1665 y arrebataron Trinidad y Tobago a España en 1797. Posteriormente conquistaron Belice, Guyana y las islas de sotavento Dominica, St. Lucía, St. Vicente y las Granadinas.⁴ Dichas islas colonizadas por los ingleses se unieron a la acción de las iglesias Bautista, Metodista y Luterana de Moravia junto a los daneses-luteranos de las Islas Vírgenes y los holandeses reformados de Aruba, Curazao, Bonaire, Saba, San Martín y San Eustaquio constituyeron las principales posesiones de las naciones europeas enemigas de España.⁵

Las primeras Biblias que entraron a Puerto Rico fue por la acción de los piratas, corsarios, contrabandistas y comerciantes ingleses, franceses, daneses y holandeses. Los corsarios y piratas que venían con el propósito de saquear las posesiones españolas del Caribe y en otras ocasiones adquirirlas para sus respectivos gobiernos incluían el esfuerzo de colocar Biblias en las manos de los habitantes como parte de sus proyectos de expansión. Todo el Caribe fue blanco de la distribución de Biblias y literatura religiosa protestante.⁶ A principios del siglo XVI, las Antillas se convirtieron en un punto de atracción para los contrabandistas extranjeros. La atención de España se hallaba puesta en México y Perú por sus riquezas de oro. El apogeo de las Antillas había sido de corta duración. Una vez se extrajo el oro que había en los ríos se hicieron varios intentos por encaminar nuestra economía hacia la producción azucarera.

De 1625 a 1700, Puerto Rico atravesó por una fase de relativo ensimismamiento económico y cultural. En términos económicos disminuyen los lazos comerciales con España que eventualmente van a ser reemplazados por tratos de contrabando con los ingleses y los franceses que en 1625 ocuparon y colonizaron la mayoría de las Antillas Menores, es decir la parte occidental de la Española y Jamaica. El contrabando había surgido como una necesidad para suplir la demanda local dado la ineptitud de España en proveer los artículos de primera necesidad, a la vez que

Rico (San Juan: 1947); Jorge Crespo Armáiz, *Fortalezas y situados: la geopolítica española en el Gran Caribe y sus efectos sobre el desarrollo económico y monetario* (1582-1809) (San Juan: Sociedad Numismática, 2005).

⁴ Samuel Silva Gotay, *Protestantismo y política en Puerto Rico, 1898-1930. Hacia una historia del protestantismo evangélico en Puerto Rico* (San Juan: Editorial U.P.R., 1997), pp. 5-6.

⁵ Ibid., p. 6.

⁶ William H. Hodges, "The Protestant Heritage of Hispaniola", *Insight*, American Baptist Home Mission Society, s. e., s. f.

les imponía una rígida política exclusivista.⁷ En Puerto Rico disminuyó la producción de azúcar y jengibre que eran grandes productos de exportación previo a 1625 y aumentó la saca clandestina de ganado, cueros, viandas y maderas. Los extranjeros acudían a nuestras costas a intercambiar harina de trigo, vinos, herramientas, vestidos de lana y algodón.⁸

En 1690, el gobernador español Gaspar de Arredondo para justificar su tolerancia hacia el contrabando expresaba:

“Si encima de la pobreza se tratase de castigar a la población por el delito del contrabando, sería afligir al afligido mayormente cuando por lo que reconozco hallo que la culpa del contrabando sería casi universal en esta ciudad e isla”.⁹

Puerto Rico ofrecía las condiciones ideales para contrabandear: era la colonia española más cercana a las Antillas Menores y la más retirada de los centros de administración. A partir de la década de 1780, el comercio de Puerto Rico se llevaba a cabo de varias formas. Primero, estaba el tráfico legal con España. Luego, “el tráfico ilegal” con los extranjeros que incluía el contrabando de cueros, café tabaco, algodón y ganado boricua.¹⁰ En las décadas de 1770 y 1780, surgió un nuevo contrincante en la batalla del exclusivismo español en América. Las Trece Colonias de Norteamérica comenzaron su guerra de independencia contra Inglaterra en 1775. En 1778, España respaldó a los independentistas norteamericanos. Los corsarios británicos no perdieron tiempo en ponerse en acción paralizando el Caribe y afectando el movimiento de mercancía española en las colonias.

A finales del siglo XVIII y mediados del siglo XIX, la realidad económica de Puerto Rico se transformó por completo. Pasó de ser una economía de subsistencia —confinada por el exclusivismo español a un enjuto comercio legal con la metrópoli asistido grandemente por un intercambio extranjero ilegal pero

⁷ Kenneth R. Andrews, *The Spanish Caribbean: Trade and Plunder, 1530-1630* (Londrés: Yale University Press, 1978).

⁸ Héctor R. Feliciano, “El comercio de contrabando en la costa sur de Puerto Rico, 1750-1778”, *Revista Review/Interamericana*, Vol. XIV (winter-spring, 1984), pp. 80-89.

⁹ Ángel López Cantos, *Historia de Puerto Rico, 1650-1700* (Sevilla: Escuela de Estudios Hispanoamericanos, 1975), pp. 254-255.

¹⁰ Morales Carrión, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 88-95.

necesario- a uno de los exportadores de azúcar más importantes del mundo durante la década de 1850 llegando a participar en el comercio internacional. A pesar de que el comercio boricua se llevaba a cabo con España, Estados Unidos y Saint Thomas. A Puerto Rico arribaban una amplia gama de mercancías de variada procedencia, en su mayoría provenientes de Francia, Alemania y de Gran Bretaña.¹¹

2. Inicios del anglicanismo en Puerto Rico

En 1868, el Partido Revolucionario triunfó en España estableciendo una Constituyente de Cortes. En 1869, este gobierno aprobó una nueva constitución cuyo artículo 21 exponía el derecho a la libertad religiosa para los españoles. Se concedió el *Decreto de Tolerancia de Cultos* el 23 de septiembre, 1869 siendo efectivo el 18 de octubre, 1870 se autorizaba el culto no católico sin más limitaciones que las reglas de la moral y el derecho.¹²

Un grupo de ciudadanos ingleses residentes en Ponce y pertenecientes a varias confesiones religiosas se organizaron con el propósito de construir un lugar de adoración y culto sagrado. Los señores William E. Lee, Thomas G. Salomons, Thomas A. Dodd, Joseph Henna, Charles G. Daly, George F. Weichers, T. Bronsted, John F. Finlay y Peter J. Minvielle (natural de Barbados y residente de Ponce desde 1836 siendo nombrado agente consular por el gobierno inglés en 1866).¹³ Este grupo de ciudadanos ingleses publicó unos documentos y escribieron varias cartas. El documento se llamó: Apelación Protestante publicado en un periódico de Ponce el 20 de noviembre, 1869. Luego, el Comité compuesto por cinco personas escribieron al Rvdmo. William Waldron Jackson, obispo de Antigua en la diócesis denominada British West Indies. Antigua era la jurisdicción anglicana más cercana a Puerto Rico por eso el pedido fue dirigido al obispo Jackson. La diócesis de Antigua fue fundada en 1842.¹⁴

¹¹ Birgit Sonesson, *Puerto Rico's Commerce, 1835-1865: From Regional to Worldwide Market Relations*. Tesis doctoral. Universidad de Nueva York, 1985.

¹² Gaceta de Puerto Rico, 1869, Núm. 126; Diario de las Sesiones del Congreso de Diputados, Legislatura de 1870-1880, tomo IV, p. 1888 citado en Samuel Silva Gotay, *Catolicismo y política en Puerto Rico*, Loc. Cit., p. 40.

¹³ *The Spirit of Missions*, Vol. 35, marzo, 1870 citado en Victor Burset, *The First Fifty Years of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Puerto Rico*. Tesis de M. Div. The General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church, 1957, p. 17.

¹⁴ Un artículo del obispo Jackson relatando las primeras gestiones para establecer una iglesia en Ponce, véase, William W. Jackson, "English Church Mission to Ponce, Porto

Del 4 al 11 de junio, 1872 el obispo Jackson visitó Ponce celebrando por ocho días oficios religiosos en casas privadas. Del 21 al 26 de 1873 ocurrió la segunda visita del obispo Jackson colocando la primera piedra del templo en presencia de los ciudadanos de origen inglés y de los visitantes católicos romanos. Del 17 al 26 de julio, 1874 el obispo Jackson acompañado de su capellán, el Rvdo. C. J. Branch estuvo con la congregación de Ponce y el 23 de julio, 1874 consagró el templo construido y dedicado a la Santísima Trinidad.¹⁵ En mayo de 1875, celebraron las primeras confirmaciones.¹⁶

Las sociedades mercantiles de extranjeros establecidas en Ponce durante los años de 1816 a 1825 la componían: los hermanos Archbald; Overman; Voigt; Wedstein; Davidson; Musenden; Tristany; Druprel y Proust fueron los primeros en iniciar un intenso comercio de esclavos con las haciendas azucareras. A partir de 1825 a 1830 surgieron otras sociedades de extranjeros en Ponce que derivaban su organización de las primeras como: Archbald, Tristany y Wedstein. De los extranjeros los que más se destacaron fueron los alemanes, franceses y estadounidenses. Los alemanes en 1819 a 1830 lograron extender el comercio local con el comercio internacional. Dichas sociedades estuvieron haciendo negocios hasta el final de la década.¹⁷ El puerto de Ponce era el principal del área sur y se especializaba en la exportación de azúcar y mieles.

Para 1840, Inglaterra se convirtió en el segundo cliente más importante para los hacendados ponceños. De Inglaterra se importaba manufacturas y maquinaria para producir azúcar. Una tecnología compleja y sofisticada que requería fuentes de financiamiento para el pago de la misma.¹⁸ La presencia diplomática británica comenzó en 1844 al inaugurar el consulado en San Juan. Pero, contaban con representantes comerciales al otorgarles permiso a factores de compañías

Rico, West Indies”, *Mission Life*, Vol. III, parte 2: Londres: 1872: 495-498 en http://anglicanhistory.org/wi/Jackson_ponce1872.html.

¹⁵ Jorge J. Rivera Torres, *Documentos históricos de la Iglesia Episcopal Puertorriqueña*, Vol. I (Santo Domingo: Editora Lozano, 1983), p. 29.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-16.

¹⁷ Ivette Pérez Vega, “Las oleadas de inmigración sobre el sur de Puerto Rico: el caso de las sociedades mercantiles creadas en Ponce, 1816-1830”, *Revista del Centro de Estudios Avanzados de Puerto Rico y del Caribe*, Vol. 4 (enero-junio, 1987): 114-123.

¹⁸ Emma A. Dávila Cox, *Este inmenso comercio: las relaciones mercantiles entre Puerto Rico y Gran Bretaña, 1844-1898* (San Juan: Editorial U.P.R. e Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 1996), p. 268.

marítimas como la South Sea Company para establecerse en la Isla. Estos factores no sólo cuidaban de los asuntos de la Compañía, sino que se interesaban por el bienestar de los marinos ingleses y participaban en litigios en cuanto a la validez de las mercancías transportadas a los puertos.

A mediados de la década de 1840, un inglés James Gilbee era el hacendado con mayor capital en la zona sur de Puerto Rico. Un irlandés Joseph Archibald y su hermano Robert Archibald comenzaron a utilizar la tecnología del molino de vapor para aumentar la producción azucarera de su hacienda.

Para 1870, identifique un grupo de anglicanos de cierto prestigio en la ciudad de Ponce: Charles E. Daly, dentista y secretario de la Junta, José M. Archevald dueño de la Hacienda Cintrona; Thomas Davidson dueño de la Hacienda Consuelo, Thomas G. Salomons propietario de la Hacienda Santa Cruz; James Gilbee dueño de la Hacienda Fortuna; Thomas A. Dodd ingeniero; Joseph Henna médico; Guillermo Oppenheimer; James Gallagher; George Wichers ciudadano alemán en 1860 era cónsul de Prusia, William E. Lee, administrador de la Hacienda Boca Chica y masón grado 33°. Posteriormente, Lee compró la Hacienda Constancia. Su firma W. E. Lee Company se dedicaba a la venta de herramientas y materiales agrícolas.¹⁹ En 1874, el historiador Lidio Cruz Monclova calcula 400 personas protestantes en Ponce, entre los cuales, había 216 daneses luteranos y 143 anglicanos.²⁰

George F. Weichers, comerciante alemán y una de las personas más ricas de Ponce donó el terreno para la construcción del templo localizado en la Calle Sur (hoy calle Marina, esquina Abolición) en la ciudad de Ponce.²¹ En marzo de 1872, el Comité tenía el dinero para ordenar una armadura prefabricada a Liverpool, Inglaterra. Durante esa época los ingenieros, arquitectos y maestros de obra no podían trabajar en la construcción por miedo a la represión del catolicismo romano y ser excomulgados si cooperaban con los anglicanos.

¹⁹ Véase, Waldemar E. Lee *An Island Growth: Memories of Albert Lee in Puerto Rico, 1873-1942* (San Juan: A. Lee & Sons, 1963).

²⁰ Lidio Cruz Monclova, *Historia de Puerto Rico en el siglo XIX*, Vol. I (San Juan: Editorial U.P.R., 1979), p. 853 citado por Silva Gotay, *Loc. Cit.*, p. 7. Estas cifras requieren mayor precisión e investigación sobre el número de personas extranjeras de origen protestante en Ponce.

²¹ Ramón Marín, *Las fiestas populares de Ponce* (San Juan: Editorial U.P.R., 1994), p. 222.

En agosto de 1873, la construcción había avanzado creando una estructura gótica de hierro galvanizado con una capacidad para albergar 350 feligreses. El templo tenía un vitral en la entrada principal y un campanario. El costo de la construcción fue de 13,500 pesos. Dicha suma fue pagada en 1874. El Comité acordó pagarle 500 pesos por un término de seis meses y 500 pesos para gastos colaterales al sacerdote que nombraran rector de la Parroquia Santísima Trinidad. Además, pedían organizar una escuela dominical y abrir una escuela de educación elemental para niños y niñas.

El templo fue consagrado el 23 de julio de 1874 nombrada a la Santísima y siempre bendita Trinidad por el Rvdm. William W. Jackson, acompañado de su capellán el Rvdo. Charles J. Branch. Se nombró como rector interino al Rvdo. John Du Bois, quien se desempeñaba como rector de la Iglesia St. Paul en Frederiksted, St. Croix.²² El primer rector fue el Rvdo. Alfred F. Giolma de 1874 a 1875. Giolma era un sacerdote inglés que había trabajado en Trinidad y Tobago, pero hablaba español. Al poco tiempo de llegar a Puerto Rico Giolma contrajo matrimonio con Carolina Armstrong, hija de una de las familias más ricas de Ponce. A los dos meses de asumir la rectoría, Giolma comenzó a tener problemas con algunos miembros de la Junta. Giolma se negó a pagar una deuda de 3,000 pesos. Varios miembros de la Junta: los señores Lee, Basanta, Dodd y James McCormick le pidieron la renuncia a Giolma. Posteriormente acusaron a Giolma con el alcalde de Ponce por predicar en contra de la Santa Madre Iglesia y del Obispo de Roma llamado "el vicario de Cristo en la Tierra".

Las quejas contra Giolma eran tener un carácter arrogante por lanzar críticas contra la procesión del Corpus Christi y por tener a católicos romanos como miembros de la congregación anglicana. Además, algunas personas no les gustaba el estilo de predicar y su orientación teológica porque lo consideraban "antipapista". El alcalde de Ponce le quitó las llaves del templo a Giolma, quien alegó ser víctima de calumnias y amenazó con ir al tribunal para reabrir el templo. El obispo Jackson se reunió con Giolma el 18 de julio de 1874. La Junta fue reorganizada y los nuevos miembros que apoyaban al P. Giolma la integraban: los señores Thomas G. Salomons, Weichers y Augusto Ganslandt. Giolma consideró que el Obispo no le había dado suficiente apoyo y el 26 de julio, 1875 renunció a su posición de rector.

²² Charles L. Colmore, "The Beginnings of Church in Puerto Rico", *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, Vol. 11 (4), diciembre, 1942, p. 399.

Unos 26 miembros de la Parroquia apoyaron a Giolma escribiendo una carta al gobernador Sanz demandando la reapertura del templo. El gobernador español José Laureano Sanz ordenó la devolución de las llaves del templo, pero le pidió al alcalde que estuviera alerta a las críticas contra la Iglesia Católica Romana.²³

Un suceso importante fue la restauración de la monarquía en España por la dinastía de los Borbones. El 3 de marzo, 1874 cayó la República y se instauró un Gobierno Provisional en Puerto Rico. El gobernador José Laureano Sanz eliminó la libertad de prensa, prohibió las asociaciones políticas y derogó las libertades de reunión, asociación y la inviolabilidad de domicilio. En 1875 se restringió la libertad de culto en Puerto Rico. Los anglicanos de Ponce hicieron una petición a la reina Victoria para que acudiera a la Corona y les permitiera reabrir el templo. Los españoles accedieron, pero impusieron las siguientes condiciones: la puerta principal tenía que estar cerrada y solamente se podía entrar por las puertas laterales, no se podían tocar las campanas, no se podían exhibir símbolos o signos religiosos en el exterior y no se podía hacer ningún tipo de propaganda religiosa.

El sucesor del P. Giolma fue el Rvdo. Zacarías Vall Spinosa, sacerdote catalán educado en Inglaterra. Vall Spinosa fue rector de la Parroquia Santísima Trinidad desde abril de 1876 a 1885. Los servicios religiosos se conducían en inglés y español uno en la mañana y otro en la tarde. Vall Spinosa estableció la escuela-parroquial.

Los anglicanos tenían problemas porque la Iglesia Católica Romana no permitía que “los herejes” fueran enterrados en cementerios en los pueblos. En un viaje a Inglaterra y Estados Unidos, Vall Spinosa consiguió donativos para adquirir un cementerio.²⁴ Hoy en día se llama cementerio Getsemaní. Al finalizar las funciones del sacerdote Vall Spinosa terminaron los oficios en español en la Parroquia Santísima Trinidad. Los otros rectores Rvdos. Messers, B. Noel Branch procedente de St. Kitts (1884-1893), H. M. Skinner (1893-1895) y una vacante de tres años nos traen a la época de la Guerra Hispanoamericana de 1898. El Rvdo. Frederick Caunt de la Diócesis de Antigua sirvió en la Parroquia de 1899 a 1901.

²³ Luis Martínez Fernández, “Puerto Rico’s First Protestant Congregations, 1869-1898” en *Protestantism and Political Conflict in the Nineteenth Century Hispanic Caribbean* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2002), pp. 91-115.

²⁴ Sobre el entierro de protestantes, véase, Luis Martínez Fernández, “Don’t die here: The Death and Burial of Protestants in the Hispanic Caribbean, 1840-1885”, *The Americas*, Vol. XLVIV (1), Julio, 1992: 23-47.

El 25 de julio de 1898 el sacristán Alexander Horton para saludar a las tropas estadounidenses que trajeron a Puerto Rico “la libertad, el progreso y la democracia” repicó las campanas para anunciar la llegada de los estadounidenses a Ponce. Algunos soldados eran miembros de la Sociedad de San Andrés (“Brotherhood of St. Andrew”) quienes abrieron el templo, limpiaron, pulieron y repicaron las campanas anunciando un oficio religioso.²⁵ En agosto de 1898 hubo un servicio religioso en memoria de los soldados caídos durante la Guerra Hispanoamericana siendo conducido por el Rvdo. P. M. Sutherland, capellán del Regimiento 19 de infantería. En diciembre, 1898 hubo un oficio religioso conducido por el Rvdo. Sutherland y el Rvdo. Valls Spinosa, ya retirado de la rectoría. En 1899, visitó la Parroquia el obispo Whipple de Minessota y en 1901 el obispo Peter King de West Virginia.²⁶

En conclusión, la Parroquia la Santísima Trinidad fue el primer templo no-romano establecido en Puerto Rico en el siglo XIX. Un análisis de clase sobre la feligresía de la Parroquia Santísima Trinidad tiene una composición semejante en algunos aspectos al modelo de misiones-parroquias en las islas británicas de las Indias Occidentales donde coexisten el culto multiétnico. La feligresía de Todos los Santos en Vieques se asemeja al culto anglicano en el Caribe angloparlante.

3. La congregación de Vieques

Otro proyecto importante surgió en Vieques cuando el mariscal de campo Gabriel Baldrich y Palau, gobernador de Puerto Rico otorgó un permiso para abrir una escuela “para enseñar los rudimentos de la fe protestante”²⁷ a Johanés Waldemar Zaccheus un carpintero de St. Croix que residía en Vieques desde 1865.²⁸ Zaccheus un carpintero de St. Croix era viudo con un hijo y residente legal de Vieques desde 1865. Zaccheus dedicó su tiempo a la actividad misionera desde 1868 hasta 1874 en los pueblos de Naguabo, Humacao y Fajardo actuando como laico. Junto a John James Hanclock nativo de Tortola fundó una escuela elemental en Vieques.

²⁵ Véase, Rivera Torres, *Op. Cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 56-57; Vol. II, p. 13.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

²⁷ Juan Macho Moreno, *Compilación legislativa de primera enseñanza en la Isla* (Madrid: Librería de la viuda de Hernando & Comp., 1895), p. 482.
Estela Cifre de Loubriel, *Catálogo de extranjeros residentes en Puerto Rico en el siglo XIX* (Río Piedras: Editorial U.P.R., 1962), p. 130.

De mayo a octubre de 1881, el Rvdo. Samper de Tortola visitó Vieques celebrando la eucaristía y administró los sacramentos sin ningún tipo de oposición del gobierno español. El Venerable Eyre Hutson, archidiacono de Islas Vírgenes y rector de la Iglesia de Todos los Santos en St. Thomas visitó Vieques de 1883 a 1885 administrando los sacramentos a la congregación anglicana. En 1885 y 1893 el obispo Branch de Antigua hizo varias visitas pastorales y hubo confirmaciones.²⁹

El templo dedicado a San José y todos los Santos fue establecido en 1880 por el Rvdmo. William W. Jackson y consagrado en 1894 por el obispo C. J. Branch. Para 1885, el encargado de la congregación de Vieques era Joseph Nathanael Bean, un catequista laico procedente de Bermuda, pero había trabajado en la isla de Jos Van Dyke. Bean había sido oficial del tesoro inglés antes de comenzar a trabajar con la Iglesia.³⁰ En 1887, falleció su esposa Lucinda Bean y decidió estudiar teología en St. Augustine College en Raleigh, North Carolina. Bean fue ordenado diácono el 17 de noviembre de 1889 en la Iglesia de San Agustín en Carolina del Norte por el obispo T. B. Lyman, D. D. Luego, el 25 de febrero de 1893 le ordenaron presbítero en la Iglesia de St. John en St. Croix por el obispo-coadjutor de Antigua, C. J. Branch.³¹

Bean solicitó ayuda económica a los anglicanos de Antigua, al poco tiempo recibió tres reales para adquirir los primeros *Libros de Oración Común*. Bean se ocupó de comprar las primeras Biblias y tuvo que hacer los candelabros y los ornamentos que utilizaron en los primeros servicios religiosos. En 1893, una campana de un barco le fue regalada a la congregación para ser instalada en el campanario.³² Durante la invasión estadounidense de 1898, se rumoraba en Vieques que los norteamericanos quemarían la isla y matarían los habitantes. Bean invitó a los oficiales estadounidenses a orar en el templo antes de proceder con su estrategia militar sobre Vieques. Bean procedió a bendecir la bandera norteamericana antes de ser colocada en el fortín de Vieques y posteriormente el progreso y la democracia reinarán en la isla-municipio de Vieques.³³

²⁹ Justo Pastor Ruiz, *Vieques: antiguo y moderno, 1493-1946* (Yauco: Tipografía Rodríguez Lugo, 1947), p. 41.

³⁰ Colmore, *Op. Cit.*, p. 401.

³¹ Colmore, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 401-402; Rivera Torres, *Op. Cit.*, p. 15.

³² El P. Bean le escribió una carta a la reina Victoria de Inglaterra el 19 de octubre, 1897 solicitando una ayuda económica para la congregación anglicana de Vieques, véase, Rivera Torres, *Op. Cit II.*, pp. 13-14; Colmore, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 401-402.

³³ Jorge J. Rivera Torres, *Documentos históricos de la Iglesia Episcopal Puertorriqueña*, Vol. II (St. Just: Taller Episcográfico, 2006), p. 22.

Joseph N. Bean sirvió con esmero por 26 años. Aunque, perdió la vista por una enfermedad de catáratas y obtuvo una pensión para su retiro. Bean fue sustituido por el Rvdo. Leonard Read que fue ordenado presbítero por el obispo Van Buren el 2 de febrero de 1905. Bean falleció en olor de santidad en 1907.

El templo estaba ubicado en la calle San José esquina Muñoz Rivera (hoy sita en el 557 de la Calle Plinio Peterson de Vieques). La estructura había sido una tonelería o almacén de azúcar. El local fue comprado al Sr. Gustavo Murria por la cantidad de 1,200 pesos. En 1932, el huracán San Ciprián destruyó toda la estructura física. El templo y la casa del vicario fue reconstruida en 1934. La congregación de Vieques estaba constituida en su mayoría por negros libres, metodistas, moravos, bautistas, anglicanos, hugonotes franceses y daneses luteranos que llegaron desde las islas vecinas cuando ocurrió la abolición de la esclavitud en 1839 y se establecieron en Vieques para el trabajo en las centrales azucareras.

A partir de 1843 se fundaron en Vieques varios ingenios azucareros: Esperanza; Puerto Real; Santa María; Playa Grande; La Arcadia y Resolución. Para las décadas de 1850 a 1860, Vieques experimentó un auge azucarero y comercial a tal punto que la población se cuadruplicó de 1846 a 1866 debido a la llegada de inmigrantes procedentes de las islas inglesas, francesas y danesas. Para 1871, en Vieques de un total de 3,700 habitantes hay constancia de unos 1,175 trabajadores cañeros de origen protestante.

En 1901, al asumir la dirección de las congregaciones de Ponce y Vieques la Iglesia Episcopal Estadounidense comenzó a enviar sacerdotes a Vieques como: A. Griffith, Reinhart, Leonard Read y la misionera laica "Miss Davidson" fueron responsables de la dirección espiritual hasta 1929. En 1929, el obispo Charles B. Colmore nombró al primer puertorriqueño para servir como vicario, el Rvdo. P. Antonio Villafañe. Éste comenzó los oficios en español porque los sacerdotes estadounidenses estaban a cargo de un tipo de capellanía a los extranjeros que emigraron a Vieques.

4. Los incios de la Iglesia Protestante Episcopal en Puerto Rico

La Convención General de la Iglesia Episcopal en Estados Unidos creó en 1898 una comisión para investigar las posibilidades de iniciar trabajo misionero en

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

Puerto Rico. Se designó al Rev. George B. Pratt a trabajar en San Juan. También autorizaron al Coronel Henry A. Brown, capellán de los “Rough Riders” quien arribo a Mayagüez en 1898. El 12 de marzo, 1899 se organizó la Iglesia de San Juan Bautista en el Viejo San Juan se nombró al Rev. George B. Pratt como rector. Pratt era capellán de las tropas estadounidenses que invadieron a Puerto Rico en 1898. A pedidos del obispo Moreland de Sacramento, California en 1900, el obispo Whipple de Minnesota visitó Puerto Rico para estudiar las condiciones religiosas en que se encontraba la Isla. En 1901, la Convención General de la Iglesia Protestante Episcopal de Estados Unidos recomendó que se nombrara un obispo en Puerto Rico respondiendo a la información que los capellanes del ejército enviaban hacia Estados Unidos y para darle continuidad al trabajo anglicano en Ponce y Vieques.³⁵

Se nominó al Dr. William C. Brown, obispo en Brasil. Brown por razones de salud no pudo ocupar el cargo. El obispo Brown se destacó por traducir al portugués el *Libro de Oración Común* y por ser un gran misionero e intelectual. Al concluir la Guerra Hispanoamericana el Ilmo. y Revdmo. Jackson con el asesoramiento del Arzobispo de Cantorbury y de los abogados eclesiásticos le dieron curso a los deseos del Sínodo Provincial de las Indias Occidentales de traspasar la jurisdicción del Obispo de Antigua sobre las misiones de la Iglesia de Inglaterra en Puerto Rico a la Iglesia Protestante Episcopal de Estados Unidos de Norte América.

La Convención General en 1901 aprobó la resolución que las iglesias en el territorio de Puerto Rico fueran organizadas como un Distrito Misionero. Se comenzó a utilizar el término en inglés “The Domestic Foreign Society of the Episcopal Church of the Missionary District of Puerto Rico”.³⁶

En 1901, la Cámara de Obispos nombró a James Herat Van Buren como nuestro primer obispo. Van Buren completó el bachillerato en la Universidad de Yale y la teología en Berkeley Divinity School. Por los últimos diez años había sido rector de la Parroquia San Estebán en Lynn, Massachusetts. En 1876, Van Buren fue ordenado diácono y presbítero en 1877. Luego, pasó a ser rector de la Iglesia de

³⁵ Los informes de los capellanes ofrecen valiosa información sobre el período bajo estudio, véase, Thomas Sherman, “Report on Conditions in Puerto Rico”, 30 de diciembre, 1898 cita en Samuel Silva Gotay, *Catolicismo y política en Puerto Rico: bajo España y Estados Unidos, siglos XIX y XX* (San Juan: Editorial U.P.R., 2005), p. 74.

³⁶ Rivera Torres, Documentos ... Vol. II, *Loc. Cit.*, pp. 13-14.

San Juan Bautista. En 1901, estableció el Distrito Misionero. Bajo el episcopado de Van Buren se adoptó el sello de nuestra Iglesia. Su labor consistió en desarrollar una Iglesia autosuficiente. Se creó una organización administrativa en la Diócesis. Se creó una constitución y cánones, organizaciones de laicos, aumentó el clero y se establecieron diez congregaciones a través de la Isla.

Summary

In this article, the author presents a detailed historical analysis of the origins and key aspects that shaped the Episcopal Church in Puerto Rico, particularly in Vieques and Ponce. The author begins by providing a historical overview and sociological description of the contexts and factors that were present during the development of this denomination. He then, traces the work of missionaries as well as local leaders who were influential and contributed with their efforts in the consolidation of the Episcopal Church in both Vieques and Ponce.

Theotokos of Byzantium & Guadalupe of Tepeyac: Patristics, Typology, and the Incarnation

Josefrayn Sánchez-Perry

1. Introduction

Over the centuries, the cult of the Virgin Mary has been inextricably connected to the enterprise of Christological discourse. To the extent that Jesus was born in the flesh, Mariology has been an interconnected undertaking. The early Christians of the church held that in the Theotokos, the Logos received his body; and for that reason, she was revered among the saints. One of the most formative expressions of Christianity in México is the image of La Virgen María de Guadalupe. She has come to represent unity, indigenization, and patriotism for many Catholics.

In 2003, Timothy Matovina, a great pioneer of U.S. Mexican-American Catholicism, published an article attempting to undertake an exposition of the underlying Patristic thought in Miguel Sánchez's account of Guadalupe.³ Matovina's work served as an accurate elucidation of the ongoing influence of Guadalupe in Mexican and Mexican-American religious dialogue, for Roman Catholics and Protestants alike. Further, his essay showed the level of nationalistic underpinnings that have clearly transcended regions and borders, which Guadalupe continues to give to the lives of those who venerate her. Without a doubt, this work ought to be celebrated!

Matovina was correct in pointing out that what bonds Guadalupe to the Patristic corpus is the use of Sánchez's typological interpretation. With that being said, Matovina also left me without a substantial comparative work. In this essay, then, I will argue that Guadalupe should be held to a substantial comparative Patristic scrutiny. In fact this is what Miguel Sánchez attempted to do in his treatise, *Imagen de la Virgen María, Madre de Dios de Guadalupe*.⁴ The essay before you is,

³ Matovina, Timothy, "Guadalupe at Calvary: Patristic Theology in Miguel Sánchez's *Imagen de la Virgen María* (1648)" in *Theological Studies* vol. 64, (2003).

⁴ Sánchez, Miguel, *Imagen de la Virgen María, Madre de Dios de Guadalupe*, (México City: Viuda de Bernardo Calderón, 1648). The published edition that I will be using in this

without question, a theological and doctrinal enterprise. That which has bonded Mariology over the centuries is the prolific, Christological work of theologians and Christian communities; and I hope that this work will reflect a similar intent.

First, an exposition of the God-Bearer will be addressed, with focus on the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, Proclus and Cyril. What will be important here is to bring to light the typological interpretations that were attributed to the Virgin Mary. Second, I will bring to light Miguel Sánchez's use of patristic sources (more than just Augustine) and typological interpretations that, Sánchez thought, were appropriate for Guadalupe. What will be important here is to show how Christology is deeply rooted in Sánchez's description of Guadalupe, and how the aftermath of Guadalupe's account reflects such Christological discourse. The Christology of Cyril and Proclus called for a particular attention to what it meant to be human. The title, Theotokos, then, served as a way to exemplify this doctrine, since she was part of the redemptive act of God. Similarly, the substantial, theological work of Sánchez, illustrates his concern for the indigenization, and incarnation of Christ in the lives of Mexican people.

2. Theotokos, typology, and the divine nature

Ancient typological interpretations and biblical exegeses served as a way to maintain the continuity between the life of the Christian Church and the Scriptures. This method of biblical exegesis was developed quite early as a means to interpret the deeper meanings in the scriptures. It can even be said that the New Testament writings are a form of typological interpretation around the figure of Jesus Christ, and what he represented in light of the Old Testament. The notion of "typology" as a concept, then, may in fact be a modern category; since, it is quite improbable that ancient exegetes used such demarcation in biblical interpretation.⁵ Over time, the typological interpretations that were associated with the Virgin Mary were developed, and at times, changed in meaning. In the midst of this development, however, the Virgin Mary was an instrument of Christological discourse.

paper is found in Beltran, Lauro, *La Primera Historia Guadalupana de México Impresa*, (México: Editorial Tradición, S. A., 1981), 49-170. Unless indicated, excerpts from Sánchez's work will be my own translations. Sánchez's work is divided into various sections, which is how his work will be cited below.

⁵ Cunningham, Mary B., "The Typology of Mary the Theotokos" in *The Church and Mary*, edited by R. N. Swanson, (Woodbridge, NY: The Boydell Press, 2004), 54.

As early as Ignatius of Antioch (ca. 50-117CE), for example, the Virgin Mary served as a way to repudiate any notion, which suggested that God did not exist in the flesh.⁶ The reality of the incarnation of the Son of God, through the virginal birth of Mary, was vital to understanding the divine, redemptive act of God.⁷ Ignatius' early characteristics of the Virgin Mary, albeit brief, instigated an exemplified way of understanding the humanity of Christ. Accordingly, he says, there is one Physician, which is made up of flesh and spirit, of Mary and God.⁸ Another early, initial title for the Virgin Mary was the "new Eve". Justin Martyr (ca. 100-165CE), who is attributed with being the first writer to make this parallel,⁹ declares that Eve brought forth disobedience and death; while the Virgin Mary, brought forth the destruction of such disobedience through her progeny.¹⁰ Apart from the New Testament authors, Justin proposed, perhaps, the first typological interpretation to be associated with the Virgin Mary and a narrative from the Old Testament. Both virgins had birthed a consequence: Eve had conceived the word of the serpent, and Mary had conceived the word of life.

Subsequently, Irenaeus of Lyon (ca. 2nd c.-202CE), expanding on the work of Justin, developed a larger exploration of typological interpretations surrounding the role of Mary as a virgin.¹¹ Undertaking the image of the "new Eve", he emphasized the role of Eve's recapitulation in Mary, thereby annulling the disobedience with obedience.¹² Or again, just as Eve had had a husband, being still a virgin, Mary having a husband and being a virgin, became instead, the cause of salvation for herself and the whole human race.¹³ It is at this point, that it may be said, Mary began to serve as an instrument for soteriological tropes. Therefore, Irenaeus asked, rhetorically, why would the Son of God descent into Mary's body,

⁶ Ignatius of Antioch, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, Art. 7, <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0104.htm>.

⁷ Ibid, Art. 19.

⁸ Ibid, Art. 7.

⁹ Gambero, Luigi, *Mary and the Church Fathers*, translated by Thomas Buffer, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999), 46.

¹⁰ Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, Art. 100, <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/01287.htm>.

¹¹ Cunningham, 54.

¹² Irenaeus of Lyon, *Proof of the Apostolic Teaching in Mary and the Fathers of the Church*, Ch. 33, Art. 62 [Gambero,55].

¹³ Irenaeus of Lyon, *Against Heresies*, Bk. 3, Ch. 22, Art. 4, <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0103322.htm>.

had the Son not needed to take something from her?¹⁴ The implication was quite clear: there was something that Mary offered (mainly, her flesh) to the redemptive act of God. Accordingly, C. Clark Carlton points out that this typological interpretation would ultimately turn into the active role of the Theotokos as the temple of God, where the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and the Son would take place.¹⁵

It is in the fifth century, then, with the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, that a full Christological justification of the role of the Virgin Mary grows into fruition. Of course, their position functioned under the prolific work of those involved in the Trinitarian controversies and the treatises on the incarnation a century before. The homilies of Proclus of Constantinople (?-ca.447CE), and the treatises of Cyril of Alexandria (376-444CE) on the unity of Christ, gave impetus to the affirmation of the title Theotokos. Most importantly, their work showed that the typological interpretations associated and attributed to the Virgin Mary, were an outlet with which to clarify her role in the incarnation.

3. Proclus of Constantinople: the Workshop of the union of natures

Around 430CE, Proclus delivered a homily during a Marian celebration, in the presence of then Bishop of Constantinople, Nestorius (386-451CE). Evoking biblical imagery and exegetical prowess, Proclus rhetorically declared, “Who ever saw, who ever heard, of God indwelling without restriction in a woman’s womb? Heaven itself cannot contain him, and yet a womb did not constrict him.”¹⁶ Consequently, because the same one was both *in* the Virgin Mary and *of* the Virgin Mary,¹⁷ “Christ did not by progress become God—heaven forbid.”¹⁸ The title Theotokos, thus, was most appropriate. Proclus’ disposition had to do with the unity of the incarnate Logos; if Mary did not give birth to God, then, the incarnate

¹⁴ Ibid, Art. 2.

¹⁵ Carlton, C. Clark, “The Temple that Held God: Byzantine Marian Hymnography and the Christ of Nestorius” in *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* vol. 50, no. 1-2 (2006), 124.

¹⁶ Proclus of Constantinople, *Homily 1* in *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity*, edited and translated by Nicholas Constas, (Leiden: Brill, 2003), Art. 2 [Constas, 139].

¹⁷ Ibid, Art. 8 [Constas, 145].

¹⁸ Ibid, Art. 4 [Constas, 141].

Logos was divided. Therefore, as a way to support this notion, he proclaimed, "If Christ is one (person) and God the Word another, then there is no longer a Trinity; but a quaternity."¹⁹

Scholars point out that, after hearing this, Nestorius did not take long to react. He held that the Virgin Mary was Christotokos, that is to say, the one who gives birth to Christ; and therefore, upon hearing (the typological interpretations) that Mary was the workshop for the union of the natures, and the bridge between God and humankind,²⁰ Nestorius' scandal was imminent. Accordingly, he says: "A creature did not produce the Creator, rather she gave birth to the human being, the instrument of the Godhead."²¹ It has been suggested that this statement best elucidates Nestorius' position.²² Nestorius was troubled that by using the title, Theotokos, Mary was being substituted as the mediator. For this reason, Nestorius declares, "the Word who dwelt in the temple formed by the Holy Spirit is one, and the temple itself is another, different from God who dwells within it."²³ While the imagery attributed to the Virgin Mary may well have been taken as mediatory, Nestorius' distress became his Christological understanding.

Nestorius' concern of the title Theotokos was completely related to his proposition of the conjunction of the two hypostasis and two natures. He made a sharp distinction between the Logos and the man Jesus Christ, by saying that, "He [Paul] did not say, 'Let this mind be in you which was in God the Logos' . . . rather, he [Paul] takes the term Christ to be an expression which signifies the two natures."²⁴ Proclus' soteriology, however, depended on the Logos dwelling in the womb; whereby, the Logos became flesh. He proclaimed that "by what he [the Logos] was, he redeemed—as Paul says, 'in him we have redemption through his blood, the remission of our trespasses' (emphasis added)."²⁵ This was not a union

¹⁹ Ibid, Art. 8 [Constatas, 145].

²⁰ Ibid, Art. 1 [Constatas, 137].

²¹ Nestorius of Antioch, *First Sermon against the Theotokos* in *The Christological Controversy*, edited and translated by Richard A. Norris, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1980), 125.

²² Carlton, 102.

²³ Constatas, 66-67; and also, Carlton, 117. Both authors point to a Latin preserved translation, in *ACO* I.5.1, 37-39.

²⁴ Nestorius of Antioch, *The First Sermon against the Theotokos* [Norris, 125-126]. While he says "natures", the context implies that he means two different "persons".

²⁵ Proclus of Constantinople, *Homily 1*, Art. 6 [Constatas, 143].

between the Logos and Christ, but a union between the Logos and the flesh. What Proclus rejected here was that the Logos was not attached to the man Christ; rather Christ was very God, very Logos.²⁶ Therefore, Proclus proclaimed that in the womb, Mary, the living temple, carried the mystery of the divine economy.

In order to explain this divine mystery, the title Theotokos was essential. And it is Proclus' exegetical work that exemplified the validity of this title: "untarnished vessel of virginity; the spiritual paradise of the second Adam [Rom.5.14]; the workshop of the union of natures; the living bush of human nature [Ex.3.2]; the veritable swift cloud [Is.19.1]; the purest fleece [Jg.6.37-38]; the awesome loom of the divine economy upon which the robe of union was ineffably woven [Jn.19.23]."²⁷ The instrument was Mary; the incarnate Logos brought salvation to humanity. The typological interpretations that were associated with the Virgin Mary are self-evident; and most importantly, rooted in Christology.

4. Cyril of Alexandria: the Container of God

Cyril's devotion to the Virgin Mary, and his contribution to her cult, may at times be mitigated by his political role in the council of Ephesus. His homilies and commentaries on the Gospel narratives, however, showed his intrinsic affection of the Theotokos. Like Proclus, Cyril believed that the title Theotokos was the most fitting term to understand the divine mystery of the incarnation. For this reason, he proclaimed that the Virgin Mary was the space whereby the Holy Spirit formed the divine body, in a way that was beyond words and laws of nature.²⁸ Once again, here, we see the mediatory role that the Virgin Mary had in the process of the salvific act of God; and the typological interpretations are no less important. In his Homily 4, against Nestorius, for example, Cyril declared that the Virgin Mary was the venerable treasure of the entire world, inextinguishable lamp, crown of virginity, scepter of orthodoxy, imperishable temple, and container of the one who cannot be contained.²⁹

²⁶ See again Nestorius' sermon against the Theotokos, where he says, "This is he [Christ] who suffered a death of three days' duration. But I worship this one [Christ] together with the Godhead because he is a sharer in the divine authority" (Norris, 129). By saying Christotokos, then, Nestorius made a distinction between the man and the divine nature.

²⁷ Ibid, *Homily 1*, Art. 1 [Constas, 137].

²⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, Sec. 2, Art. 22 [Gambero, 244].

²⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, *Homily 4 Preached at Ephesus against Nestorius*, [Gambero, 247].

In his second letter to Nestorius, Cyril attempted to defend and explain his Christological position, by saying, “We do not say that the Logos became flesh by having his nature changed;”³⁰ instead, the natures were brought to an “unspeakable and unutterable convergence into unity, one Christ and one Son out of the two.”³¹ This did not mean, of course, what Nestorius proposed, that Christ was born, and that the Logos subsequently descended upon him. Just like Proclus, for Cyril, the union does not happen between the man Christ and the Logos (since they are presumably the same person); but between the flesh (the human reality) and the Logos. Where does the Logos receive the divine flesh? The holy Virgin. The union happens in the womb, the container, so that the Logos can be said to be born in the flesh, and not descend on a human being. This is the scandal! It was God in the womb; it was God, the Logos, who become flesh. Therefore, it is not that there are two Sons who are seated at the throne,³² one of which is shearer of the divine nature;³³ rather, there is only one, on account of the union in the womb of the Virgin Mary.³⁴

In the correspondence, Nestorius reiterated the concern which has already been mentioned, but explicated it in further detail. It is here, also, that C. Clark Carlton may have pointed out an important divergence between Nestorius and the position of Cyril of Proclus; mainly, that Nestorius did not agree with the typological interpretations associated with the Virgin Mary. Therefore, he sarcastically affirms what his opposition was allegedly suggesting, that “the qualities which attach naturally to God the Logos are corrupted by his conjunction with his temple;”³⁵ in other words, “the sinless temple, which is also inseparable from the divine nature, underwent birth and death on behalf of sinners.”³⁶ Nestorius did not have a problem with the temple being passible; but he did have a problem with the temple being impassible. Here it should become clear that Nestorius did not mean by “temple”, what Cyril and Proclus meant by temple. In other words, for Nestorius, the temple was Christ, the human instrument, in which the Logos made a dwelling.³⁷ For Cyril and Proclus, the temple was the Virgin Mary.

³⁰ Cyril of Alexandria, “Second Letter to Nestorius” [Norris, 132].

³¹ Ibid [Norris, 133].

³² Ibid [Norris, 134].

³³ Nestorius of Antioch, “First Sermon against the Theotokos” [Norris, 129].

³⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, “Second Letter to Nestorius” [Norris, 134].

³⁵ Nestorius of Antioch, “Second Letter to Cyril” [Norris, 137].

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ In order to prove his position, Nestorius used the phrase in the Gospel of John,

The Christology of Nestorius, then, affected the way in which he accepted the title Theotokos and Mary's typological interpretations. The Virgin Mary could not be Theotokos because, she did not give birth to God, but gave birth to Christ, to whom the Logos descended upon. Cyril, however, declared that the idea of the Virgin's birth does not imply that the Logos found a beginning; this notion was at once stupid and pointless.³⁸ Instead, the Logos was born of a woman, after being united in human reality, hypostatically (into one person) in the womb; and this is why the Logos is said to have a fleshly birth.³⁹ This is what made the Virgin Mary the incubator of the divine nature, the fact that inside her was no mere human, but God in the flesh. In addition, when Cyril's opposition proclaimed that the divine Logos had not undergone a birth from a woman, in the flesh, according to him, his opposition bankrupted the economy of salvation.⁴⁰ That is to say, if the one who was rich was not impoverished, humanity has not gained the Logos' riches, and are still in poverty, still enslaved to sin and death; the Logos becoming flesh is the only thing that can undo the consequences of human nature.⁴¹

5. Theotokos in Byzantium: brief recap

What has been proposed in this section of the paper is how the typological interpretations associated with the Virgin Mary were deeply rooted in Christological discourse. The title, Theotokos, the one who gives birth to God, was used as a way to exemplify the divine mystery of the incarnation. Both Proclus and Cyril defended their position in order to validate the unity of Christ, and the role of the Virgin Mary in the redemptive act of God, over against the allegations of Nestorius and his followers. In addition, this section elucidated Nestorius' concern over the "temple" imagery that was associated with the Virgin Mary. Nestorius' understanding of the man Christ as the temple of God (instead of the Virgin Mary), led him to deny the title Theotokos. In other words, the Logos indwells in the man Christ, making the man a shearer in the divine nature. Therefore, Nestorius proposed Christotokos as an alternative title for the Virgin Mary.

"Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it" [Jn.2.19]. Accordingly, Nestorius interprets by saying, "He [Jesus] did not say, 'Destroy my divinity and in three days I will raise it'" [Norris, 137].

³⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, "Second Letter to Nestorius" [Norris, 133].

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Cyril of Alexandria, *On the Unity of Christ*, translated by John Anthony McGuckin, (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Press, 1995), 59.

⁴¹ Ibid [McGuckin, 59-60].

It is said that the title Theotokos manifested a particular soteriological trope, which is tied to a particular understanding of salvation. For Cyril and Proclus (and the earlier Mediterranean Christians), salvation was about becoming a complete human being, through the process of *theosis*. Some contemporary Protestant discourses of salvation, for instance, may not necessarily hold this view; which is why the Virgin Mary is not vital to salvation. That is to say, salvation is generally attained through the death and resurrection of Christ, and this does not necessitate the role of the Theotokos. Obviously, this is not what the fifth century Christians were concerned with. The suggestion of Nestorius implied that Mary had given birth to Christ, and not to the Logos made flesh. On the other hand, Cyril suggested that this Christology bankrupted the divine economy; if it was the case that God the Logos did not become human, then, the Logos did not fully participate in human reality.

6. Diosinantzin, typology, and the human nature

Just like the typological interpretations during the fifth century served as a way to maintain the language, symbolism, and continuity of the Scriptures with the contemporary lives of Christians, the narrative of Miguel Sánchez (1594-1678CE), concerning Our Lady of Guadalupe, attempted to follow the same method of biblical exegesis into the New World. His work, primarily a theological account of the apparition of the Mother of God in México City, is also an account of Christian colonial interpretation. What Guadalupe represented for Sánchez, a criollo, was the coming of the eschaton, the beginning of the new land under the auspices of his patron saint, Guadalupe.⁴² For this reason he says, “[If] in her icon the church was signified, then, also by the hand of the Virgin Mary, the new world was won and conquered.”⁴³ Patricia Harrington rightly points out that for Spanish colonizers, the eschatological expectations of “the new earth”, particularly found in the book of Revelation, were being fulfilled before their very eyes.⁴⁴ This typological “fulfillment” of the Scriptures represents a new kind of Christological discourse. Initially, with the Mother of God in Spanish America, Christology was implemented by the sword. To mitigate or ignore this would be ignore the significance that Guadalupe would have with later Christians.

⁴² Brading, D. A., *Mexican Phoenix: Our Lady of Guadalupe: Image and Tradition across Five Centuries*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 55.

⁴³ Sánchez, place [Beltran, ¿]

⁴⁴ Harrington, Patricia, “Mother of Death, Mother of Rebirth: the Mexican Virgin of Guadalupe” in *Journal of American Academy of Religion*, vol. 56, no. 1 (1988), 27.

The apparition of (the icon) of *Our Lady of Guadalupe* was first seen by a Nahua peasant, Juan Diego, on the hill of Tepeyac, outside México City. The account is said to have taken place on the morning of December 9, 1531. The two earliest written and published records, however, do not appear until the late 1640's. Modern historians, therefore, have pointed out the obvious gap from the original oral account, and also possible discrepancies that the content of the narratives may have. The historical criticisms of the apparition narratives are certainly important; this article, however, will not be concerned, completely, with historical exegesis.

Before Guadalupe had appeared, Harrington is emphatic that Aztec peoples associated death and destruction with the work of deviant goddesses. The images of Mary, therefore, which were introduced by Cortés (1485-1547CE), and thereafter, must have initially been interconnected to the death and humiliation of the Aztec world (both physical and spiritual) by the Spanish conquistadors.⁴⁷ It appears to be the case, also, that as Cortés made his way into México, desecrating the altars and sacred places of the indigenous people, he replaced the Aztec gods with statues of Mary and the cross.⁴⁸ If indeed, Mary, the Mother of God, with her Christological associations made evident in Christian doctrine,⁴⁹ was the same Mary, Mother of God, which was the patron of the Conquest, then, the Virgin Mary, in the eyes of the indigenous people, engendered a Christology implemented by the sword. However, the qualification of her presence was not

⁴⁵ For a substantial historical work on the apparitions of Guadalupe see, Chauvet, Fray Fidel de Jesus, *El Culto Guadalupano del Tepeyac: Sus Orígenes y sus Críticos en el Siglo XVI*, (México: Centro de Estudios Bernardino de Sahagún, 1978), where Chauvet collects all the Christian treatises and testimonies concerning Our Lady of Guadalupe prior to the written and published narratives of Miguel Sánchez and Luis Lasso de la Vega.

⁴⁶ Harrington, 29-30.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Hall, Linda B., *Mary, Mother and Warrior: The Virgin in Spain and the Americas*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 50-60. Cortés' desecrations appear to be connected with the Aztec practice of human sacrifice.

⁴⁹ See, for example, *Doctrina christiana en lengua mexicana, 1553*, a treatise of Christian catechism for Nahua children, formulated by Fray Padre de Gante in 1553CE, which states that, "When the Child of God was placed insider her [the Virgin Mary], she was maiden. And when she was pregnant she was maiden . . . [a]nd when she had given birth, she was forever maiden. Today she is maiden, and she is the Mother of God as a man" (Burkhart, 58).

always consistent, and was at times ambivalent with the indigenous population; records of religious appropriation with popular goddesses, as well as Christian syncretism, for example, were evident in Marian devotion.⁵⁰

Fray Bernardino de Sahagún (1500?-1590CE), on occasions, criticized and discouraged the use of *tonantzin* [our Mother] and *totlazohnantzin* [our precious Mother] as a way to refer to the Virgin Mary in the Nahuatl language.⁵¹ The title Tonantzin had implications because, according to Sahagún, the cult of the goddess Tonantzin was visited, from far and by many, before a church was built there in the name of the Virgin of Guadalupe; and thereafter, the Nahuatl continued to pay homage and devotion to Tonantzin, without any Christian distinction.⁵² Presumably, even after churches in the name of the Virgin Mary had been established in the area, indigenous people still came to *this one*, on the hill of Tepeyac. But of course, the Virgin Mary was not just any kind of mother; she was a very specific type of mother, the Mother of God, Theotokos, Deipara. It is for theological reasons, then, that Sahagún proposes the term Diosinantzin [Mother of God].⁵³

It is the theological account of Miguel Sánchez, therefore, that crystalized and validated the cult of Guadalupe as a valid expression of Marian devotion; although the theological work may have already been under way, as can be seen above. And it is here, also, that the Christological associations of Diosinantzin, as a full expression of Nahuatl Christianity, took flesh. The face of God, through Mary, as it had been introduced by Cortés and other colonizers, was now in the flesh of the native peoples. In other words, the human nature of the Nahuatl, by way of Guadalupe, was now the flesh of the Logos as well.

7. Miguel Sánchez: the covenant at Mount Sinai

The first section of Sánchez's account of Guadalupe begins with a commentary on the book of Revelation, where Sánchez declared, "A great miracle appeared patterned on the sky . . . it was displayed on a canvas, a picture retouched. It was a woman dressed in all lights, dressed with the sun, but not blinding, with her feet on

⁵⁰ Burkhart, Louise M., *Before Guadalupe: The Virgin Mary in Early Colonial Nahuatl Literature*, (Austin: University of Texas, 2001), 4.

⁵¹ Sahagún, *Historia de las Cosas de Nueva España* [Chauvet, 65].

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

the moon, crowned with twelve stars that did not fade.”⁵⁴ For Sánchez, the woman in the book of Revelation was now revealed as the woman that appeared to Juan Diego on the hill of Tepeyac. The prosligion of the treatise, then, served as a clear, biblical and exegetical legitimation of the Guadalupan cult. It is vital to note, also, that Sánchez was attempting to associate Guadalupe with the early church typological interpretations. The use of Revelation chapter 12 as a way to identify apparitions of the Virgin Mary was not exclusive to the apparition in the hill of Tepeyac; in fact, the record can be traced as early as Gregory of Nyssa’s (?-386CE), *The Wonder Worker*.⁵⁵ But Sánchez, himself, call on his saint, Augustine, as the one who showed him the interpretation of the narrative in the book of Revelation.⁵⁶

In the actual apparition accounts, two important typological interpretations of the narrative are brought to light by Sánchez. First, it is the image of the Virgin Mary as the Bride and the City. In the first apparition, this is how the Virgin Mary decided to present herself to the Nahua peasant, Juan Diego. Accordingly, Sánchez interpreted, she was “as a Bride, since she is legitimately, [the Bride] of God, and like a City, since she was, indeed, representing her city of Mexico.”⁵⁷ Sánchez interprets the narrative of Guadalupe in light of (1) the book of Revelation, where the Apostle John is shown the New Jerusalem descending, and where the bride and the city would become one; but also, (2) the words of Ambrose of Milan (ca. 340-397CE). Sánchez calls Mary the *Illuminatrix*, because she transformed México by her love, and with the lights of God. To have the lights of Mary, is to have the lights of God, in accordance with the words of Ambrose, *Maria Deus ex genere meo*, which Sánchez translates as, “to say that God is from my lineage, means confessing to have the lights of God.”⁵⁸

Second, it is the image of the Virgin Mary as the Ark of the Covenant. In this interpretation of the third apparition, the peasant Juan Diego is associated with Moses, and the Virgin Mary as the true Ark of the Covenant. Therefore, Sánchez says, “God has chosen this one Indian, to be the Messenger and Server of the

⁵⁴ Sánchez, “Original Prophetico de la Santa Imagen” [Beltran, 50]. Throughout, Sánchez deliberately alters the text as a way of commenting on how Guadalupe is associated as the woman dressed with the Sun.

⁵⁵ Pelikan, Jaroslav, *Mary Through the Centuries: Her Place in the History of Culture*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 178.

⁵⁶ Sánchez, “Original Prophetico de la Santa Imagen” [Beltran, 52].

⁵⁷ Sánchez, “Primera Aparición” [Beltran, 79].

⁵⁸ Ibid [Beltran, 80].

Temple, the House of Guadalupe, where the true Ark would be kept, which is Mary.”⁵⁹ Just like Moses had climbed Mount Sinai in order to receive the commandments of God, and just like he was asked to go alone [Ex.20], Guadalupe calls “only him [Juan Diego] to go up to the indicated Mount, where he would talk and communicate with the Virgin Mary, his Mother.”⁶⁰ Sánchez did what others before him had interpreted; mainly, that associating Mary with the Temple was like saying that inside her, was the presence of the very God.

Sánchez went on to briefly identify Guadalupe with the ark of Noah (Gen.6), the burning bush on the mount that appeared to Moses (Ex.3), the ladder of Jacob (Gen.28), and the door of the east, forever closed (Ezek.44).⁶¹ Here, Sánchez gave no explanation, since he felt that his commentary above was sufficient Christian witness to validate the Virgin Mary of Guadalupe, and her growing cult. One typological interpretation stands above all, however: Guadalupe gave birth to God in the flesh. An indicator for Sánchez, in the narrative of Juan Diego and Guadalupe, was that the flesh which the Logos took from the Virgin Mary was no mere flesh; but a flesh that belonged to the indigenous, criollo and mestizo people. And it is in this way that Sánchez’s Christological discourse has moved so many Mexican and Mexican-Americans today; and even other interested parties.⁶² To this we turn.

8. Theotokos of Byzantium & Diosinantzin of Tepeyac

Theologians have, often, seen Guadalupe as the Virgin of the peasants; making her image the validation of the preferential option for the poor. Certainly, she appeared first to an indigenous peasant; and only then, to the religious elite.⁶³ What I wish to highlight in this section, then, is the continuity between the Christological controversy of the fifth century and the Christological implications of Guadalupe as the one who gives birth to God. At the most essential level, this is what Sánchez attempted to accomplish; that is, the Virgin Mary of Guadalupe is the Theotokos. In the end, the Christological underpinnings of Sánchez’s work, in fact, gives credit to a personal option for mestizo and indigenous humanity.

⁵⁹ Sánchez, “Tercera Aparición” [Beltran, 86].

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid, “Signum” [Beltran, 110].

⁶² Johnson, Maxwell, *The Virgin of Guadalupe: Theological Reflections of an Anglo-Lutheran Liturgist*, (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002).

⁶³ Sánchez, “Segunda Aparición” [Beltran, 83].

After expositing the apparition narratives, Sánchez declares, “my concept finds its weight in the words of Saint Proclus of Constantinople, *Vellus mundissimum coelesti pluuiam madens, ex quo Pastor ouem induit*,” which he translates, “The Virgin Mary, purest skin [vellocino], drinking and submerged in the shower of the holy spirit, and of her, like the flesh [vellocino], clothed Christ our Pastor in order to dress his faithful sheep.” If we take Sánchez’s intent seriously, then, we have to evoke what Proclus of Constantinople said, concerning the Theotokos, and apply it to Guadalupe. Proclus’ disposition of the term, the one who gives birth to God, was intrinsically linked to the incarnation of the Logos. In the same way, also, Cyril wanted to maintain the unity of Christ. For both of them, Christ (the man) was not a different “person” from the divine Logos. The divine nature and the human nature were united, without confusion.

For this reason, it seems, Sánchez designated the title, *Illuminatrix*, to Guadalupe. It is Guadalupe who gives flesh to God, who introduces monotheism *without* the sword, and illuminates the indigenous people, pulling them away from idolatry.⁶⁵ And, it is because God was birthed in the flesh of the indigenous people, that Diosinantzín has a prolific fruition. Once again, this is the scandal! That is to say, the religious elites failed to believe that the Blessed Virgin Mary had appeared to the indigenous peasant, Juan Diego, the catechumen who had recently converted from idolatry.⁶⁶ Sánchez associates Juan Diego with Mary Magdalene, who “at the moment in which Christ was resurrected . . . diligently went to the apostles that same morning in order to tell them of the good news, and they did not believe her.”⁶⁷ The theological message of the incarnate reality, through the Virgin of Guadalupe, was ever pressing for Sánchez.

What further crystalizes the connection between the fifth century and Sánchez’s treatise is that Sánchez was well aware of what he meant when he said that the Logos took the flesh of the indigenous Mary. Here, we recall the Christological saying, “by what he was, he redeemed.” Sánchez, therefore, declared, “[Proclus] preached in Mary the flesh [vellocino] in general, benefiting all humanity.”⁶⁸ The Logos took on the human reality, not a specific kind of flesh. That is to say, the

⁶⁴ Sánchez, “Signum” [Beltrán, 111].

⁶⁵ Carrillo, Salvador, *El Mensaje Teológico de Guadalupe*, (México: Instituto de Sagrada Escritura, 1994), 21.

⁶⁶ Sánchez, “Segunda Aparición” [Beltrán, 83].

⁶⁷ Ibid [Beltrán, 82].

⁶⁸ Sánchez, “Signum” [Beltrán, 111].

Christian God did not just come in the form of a conquistador, as it had previously happened, but comes also in the flesh of the Nahua and mestizo people. It is in the workshop of the union of the natures, the temple where the Logos and the Holy Spirit dwelled, the true Ark of the Covenant, the living bush of human nature, in Diosinantzin of Guadalupe, that Christianity became incarnate for the Mexican people.

Matovina has rightly pointed out that Sánchez's work exerted his theological prowess and patristic knowledge.⁶⁹ Just like Proclus and Cyril had called attention to the term Theotokos as a way to understand the divine mystery of God becoming flesh, Sánchez attempted to unify the Mexican people under one ideal: Guadalupe, the one who gave birth to God in the flesh. Showing his patriotic leanings, Sánchez says that, this "one Holy Image of Our Mexican Guadalupe" holds perpetual privilege and title over all other images and miracles.⁷⁰ The incarnational and typological work of Sánchez would come to a climax in the person of Fr. Miguel Hidalgo (1753-1811CE). Hidalgo took up the banner of the image of Guadalupe as a symbol of Mexican pride and heritage during the Mexican War of Independence from Spain. Nothing has been more monumental in Mexican history than this event. The Christ took the flesh of Guadalupe, thereby giving flesh and liberation to the indigenous and mestizo people of México; quite the Christological statement.

In this article I have shown that the Christological and typological work of Proclus of Constantinople and Cyril of Alexandria, during the controversies of the fifth century, were intrinsically influential on the treatise of Miguel Sánchez's validation of the Virgin Mary of Guadalupe. In addition, I have elucidated the relationship between the Christian doctrine of the incarnation of the Logos, and the significance of Guadalupe.

⁶⁹ Matovina, 806-807.

⁷⁰ Sánchez, "Milagro" [Beltran, 76].

Resumen

En este artículo se presenta un estudio comparativo, en el cual se yuxtaponen la relación de los espacios mariológicos: el primero fue durante la controversia del siglo V, con Nestóreo, Cirilo de Alejandría y Proclo de Constantinopla; el segundo siendo el desarrollo del siglo XVI, con la Virgen de Guadalupe durante la ocupación española en México. Esta conversación se delinea a través de la doctrina de la cristología. Adicionalmente, este trabajo sirve para llenar los espacios vacíos que abarcan las influencias patrísticas y cristológicas de Miguel Sánchez y su *Imagen de la Virgen María*. La encarnación del Logos con la carne de Diosinantzin de Guadalupe representa la inculturación del discurso cristológico; aunque fue construido bajo un programa criollo, la influencia mariológica en México, sobre todo con mestizos e indígenas, es sin duda extensa. Es esta la razón por la cuál había sido inicialmente usada en la introducción de la Virgen María por la espada de Cortés y sus seguidores, a través de Guadalupe, se convirtió en una de las expresiones más poderosas del cristianismo Nahuatl. Cristológicamente, que el Logos tomó la carne de Guadalupe hace necesario que el Logos tome también la carne de los pueblos nahuatl y las tierras mestizas.

